| Source | Description | General Comments | Previously addressed in 2001 Plan RACM Analysis? | Are reductions de minimis? | Economically or technologically infeasible? | Would measure expedite attainment date? | MTC authority to implement /enforce? |
|-------------------|--|--|---|----------------------------|--|---|--|
| Correspondence | | | | | | | |
| Charlie Cameron | Work commuting education and mass transit | Effects of general educational programs not predictable in terms of future emission reductions. | | | | | |
| Shanna O'Hare, #1 | Mid-day fare free zones in congested downtown areas | Shuttles could reduce downtown traffic congestion, but limited services not expected to produce significant regional emission reductions. | | | Current economic problems preclude major expansion of transit service between now and 2006 (i.e., operators currently cutting back service). | | |
| Shanna O'Hare, #2 | Implement Safe Routes to Transit | Effect on transit use difficult to analyze, as routes and improvements have not been identified. | | Unknown | | | |
| Sherman Lewis, #1 | Consider High Occupancy Toll network | Implementation of broad based network for allowing SOVs into HOV lanes for a price, being considered on a corridor by corridor basis. | | | | Implementation timeframe not within attainment date. | |
| Sherman Lewis, #2 | Air pollution charges on parking in Severe Work Attraction Zones | Parking fees in various forms have been extensively analyzed in the past using MTC travel demand model. Method for implementation remains problematic. | Yes, see "18" on page 99 | | | Unlikely to advance date, given potential public and business concerns and length of time it would require to implement proposal. | Authority for parking charges would be local, requiring agreements from numerous separate jurisdictions. |
| Matt Williams, #1 | Implement AC Transit Enhanced Bus improvement projects | Improvements require new capital and operating funds. | | | Current economic problems preclude major expansion of transit service between now and 2006 | No, for reasons in column to the left | |
| Matt Williams, #2 | Low income student bus pass program | Two year pilot program underway. Purpose of program is to promote better school attendance for students who generally already use transit | | Yes | | | |

| Source | Description | General Comments | Previously addressed in 2001 Plan RACM Analysis? | Are reductions de minimis? | Economically or technologically infeasible? | Would measure expedite attainment date? | MTC authority to implement /enforce? |
|-------------------------|---|--|---|----------------------------|---|---|---|
| Steve Goetz, #1 | Real time bus information/arrival displays | Impact of real time arrival information on attracting new riders to transit will vary by operator, and is difficult to predict a priori. | | Could be de minimis | | Implementation of technology would extend beyond attainment date. | |
| Steve Goetz, #2 | Carsharing services at BART stations | Evaluated in FSM 5; will be considered as possible future TCM | | | | | |
| Steve Goetz, #3 | Developer based trip reduction ordinances | Some cities require, many do not; cannot be mandated by MTC/Air District | | | | | Neither MTC nor Air District have ability to condition local development |
| Steve Goetz, #4 | Ramp metering to manage the flow of traffic on freeways, | Being implemented in various corridors; better techniques needed to assess emission tradeoffs between idling at on ramps and freer traffic flow on freeways. | | | | | Requires local cities to sign off |
| David Schonbrunn, #1 | June 16, 2003 Letter Requests specific consideration of a number of TCMs being evaluated by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, tailored to the Bay Area | | | | | Limited impact by 2006 | MTC could not ensure use of guidance by local governments. |
| David Schonbrunn, #2 | April 28, 2002 Measures-TCM 1 Condition MTC funds to public agencies on: 1) having a Commuter Choice Program 2) charge for parking at commercial lots and require commercial lots to significantly raise their fees 3) require cities to support signal pre-emption for buses | Similar to measure submitted for 2001 OAP | Yes, See "1" to "3" on pages103-105 | | | | |

| Source | Description | General Comments | Previously addressed in 2001 Plan RACM Analysis? | Are reductions de minimis? | Economically or technologically infeasible? | Would measure expedite attainment date? | MTC authority to implement /enforce? |
|--------------------------|--|--|---|----------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------------|
| David Shonbrunn, #3 | April 28, 2002 Measures: TCM 2 Provide more funding for regional transit, including setting new ridership targets and allocating funds to meet these targets | Similar to measure submitted for 2001 OAP | Yes, See "1" and "1a", pages 79- 80 and "5" on page 107 | | | | |
| David Schonbrunn, #4 | April 28, 2002 Measures: TCM 3 Implement congestion pricing on bridges and use funds to offset costs of transit for low income riders | Similar to measure submitted for 2001 OAP; congestion pricing has been proposed to author of new bridge toll bill (SB 916) | Yes, see "17" on page 98 | | | | |
| David Schonbrunn, #5 | April 28, 2002 Measures: TCM 4 Re-establish legislative authority for trip reduction ordinances | Similar to measure submitted for 2001 OAP | Yes, see "8" on page 109 | | particularly during a recession | Unlikely to advance date, given difficulty in seeking legislative approval | |
| David Schonbrunn, #6 | April 28, 2002 Measures: TCM 5 MTC shall allocate CMAQ separately from other sources | Similar to measure submitted for 2001 OAP; programming policy, not a TCM | | | | | |
| David Schonbrunn, #7 | April 28, 2002 Measures: TCM 6 Air District to conduct indirect source review of such as major freeway interchanges and mitigate, such as by limiting parking ratios | Similar to measure submitted for 2001 OAP | Yes, see "9" on page 109 | | | | |
| David Schonbrunn, #8 | April 28, 2002 Measures: TCM 7 Any project included RTP must have completed a Major Investment Study that analyzes a transit /Smart Growth alternative | | Yes, see"10" on page 109 | | | | |
| David Schonbrunn, #9 | April 28, 2002 Measures: TCM 8 Modify MTC travel model to accurately predict latent demand and effects of pedestrian friendly land use | Similar to measure submitted for 2001 OAP; not a TCM | Yes, see "11" on page 110 | | | | |
| David Schonbrunn, #10 | April 28, 2002 Measures: TCM 9 Commit specific percentage of MTC discretionary funds to Smart Growth incentives | | Yes, see "7" on page 108 | | | | |

| Source | Description | General Comments | Previously addressed in 2001 Plan RACM Analysis? | Are reductions de minimis? | Economically or technologically infeasible? | Would measure expedite attainment date? | MTC authority to implement /enforce? |
|---|--|---|---|----------------------------|---|---|--------------------------------------|
| David Schonbrunn, #11 | April 28, 2002 Measures: TCM 10 Require cities and counties to implement a menu of Smart Growth measures (various proposals) before they can receive any transportation improvement funds | Smart Growth incentives are currently being developed by regional agencies. | | | | Benefits would be beyond 2006 | |
| David Schonbrunn, #12 | April 28, 2002 Measures: TCM 11 Air District would purchase development rights for land on urban fringes and trade with urban cities for increased densities near transit | Implementation approach is problematic; emission reductions cannot be assessed. | | | | Timeframe would be long term | |
| John Kyle | Conversion of Hayward Airport to a truck travel center similar to the center at I-5 and State Route 99. | | | | | Unlikely, given time required to approve and develop truck stop, as proposed. | |
| Measures suggested at Ozone Working Group meetings | | | | | | | |
| Suggestion 1 | Measures included in the Clean Air Plan to meet state air quality standards should be included in SIP | themselves collections of | | | | | |
| Suggestion 2 | Use previous research linking land use and transportation to develop control measures | Measure not sufficiently defined. | | | | | |
| Suggestion 3 | Consider control measures currently being evaluated by Sacramento air district | See analysis below under SMAQMD | | | | | |

| Source | Description | General Comments | Previously addressed in 2001 Plan RACM Analysis? | Are reductions de minimis? | Economically or technologically infeasible? | Would measure expedite attainment date? | MTC authority to implement /enforce? |
|---------------|---|---|---|----------------------------|---|--|---|
| Suggestion 4 | Education program regarding detrimental effects of older vehicles and how to reduce emissions from older vehicles | Under review as an episodic program (via a survey of older vehicles); effects of general educational programs not predictable in terms of future emission reductions | | | | | |
| Suggestion 5 | Implement transit productivity enhancements, | Emission benefits would depend on the type of productivity improvement. A number of productivity improvements have been implemented in the past. | Yes, see "1g" on page 83 | Depends on measure | | | |
| Suggestion 6 | Proof of transit fare payment, Ecopass | Regional smart card will provide basis for future fare collection; Commuter Check available to employers/employees. | | | | | |
| Suggestion 7 | Regional Transportation Impact Mitigation Fee charged to new development | Emission reductions would depend on a complex chain of assumptions about future economic conditions affecting development. Emission reductions cannot be quantified. | | | | Impact fee would affect future development versus having a near term impact. | Authority does not exist to impose such a fee. |
| Suggestion 8 | Implement an employee Commuter Choice program -program would include parking cash out, Commuter Check, vanpool support, bikes, etc. | Commuter Choice is a suite of programs, some of which are being implemented and some of which are restricted by state law. Parking cash out program, as defined by state law, was examined under FSM 7. | Yes, see "3" on page 86. | employer s subject | Potentially significant economic impacts in terms of costs to employers for expanded Commuter Choice, particularly during a recession | | No |
| Suggestion 9 | Tie local transportation funding from MTC to local compliance with air quality plans | Measure not specific. | Yes, see "13" on page 94 | | | | MTC's enabling statutes do not confer power to condition funds for such broad purposes |
| Suggestion 10 | Regional parking policy manual suggesting reduction of parking ratios near transit | Air quality benefits of parking reductions would depend on a variety of local factors. "Guidance" would not directly lead to emission reductions. | | Yes, for manual | | Unlikely given time to have guidance implemented at local level | |

| Source | Description | General Comments | Previously addressed in 2001 Plan RACM Analysis? | Are reductions de minimis? | Economically or technologically infeasible? | Would measure expedite attainment date? | MTC authority to implement /enforce? |
|--|---|--|---|----------------------------|---|---|--|
| Suggestion 11 | Improve transit access or proximity to day care | Consideration in definition of MTC's Lifeline Transit Network | | | Current economic conditions preclude addition of significant new Lifeline transit service between now and 2006. | | |
| Suggestion 12 | Encourage telecommuting on high ozone days | Episodic measures present difficulty in terms of obtaining SIP credits | | | | | Employers control work rules and schedules of their employees. |
| Suggestion 13 | Pedestrian-friendly development standards | Measure not specific. | | | | Impacts likely beyond 2006 | |
| Suggestion 14 | Control parking in new development | Measure not specific, but assume it means limiting parking supply; impact would vary with local conditions | | | | Impacts likely beyond 2006 | Parking supply is under local government authority |
| Suggestion 15 | Encourage transit oriented development (TOD) and transportation demand management (TDM) features in zoning | Measure depends on independent actions of many cities. Air quality benefits would depend on a variety of local factors and be long term | Yes, see "3" on page 105 | | | | |
| Sacramento Metro. Air Quality Management District(SMAQMD) TCMs | | | | | | | |
| 23 | Collect fees and tolls from drivers to use roads or enter areas | Success in reducing emissions would depend on availability of alternative modes. Restrictions on driving in downtown areas would likely have more CO benefit than ozone. | Yes, See "7" on page 90 | | , | Complexity, public and business concerns would make implementation before 2006 highly unlikely. | |
| 28 | Require that Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds be used only for projects that significantly improve air quality | See response above (Schonbrunn #6) | | | | | |
| 43 | Automate speed enforcement and lower the speed limit to 55 mph for heavy duty vehicles | Speed enforcement evaluated in FSM 3; technical issues with estimating VOC/NOx reductions. Speed limit for trucks is already set at 55 mph. | | | | Lengthy implementation due to technology development/deploy-ment | |

| Source | Description | General Comments | Previously addressed in 2001 Plan RACM Analysis? | Are reductions de minimis? | Economically or technologically infeasible? | Would measure expedite attainment date? | MTC authority to implement /enforce? |
|--------|---|---|---|------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 45 | Restrict idling of trucks with rules and devices | Difficult to implement and enforce; idling devices on trucks would be a technology based measure | | | | Truck idling would primarily affect NOx, which may not expedite attainment. | Unclear enforcement responsibility. |
| 176 | Develop a station car/low emission vehicle share program | See response above (Goetz) | | | | | |
| 151 | Re-evaluate the traffic volumes that trigger ramp-metering lights | See response above (Goetz #4) | | | | | |
| 303 | Automobile insurance is charged at the pump or insurance is mileage based | Would require state legislation. Mileage based fees not directly related to emissions for newer cars. | Also see "17" on page 98 | | | No due to likely length of legislative process to enact new pricing schemes | |
| 215 | Secure funding for expanded transit | See response above (Schonbrunn #3) | Yes, see "1" and "1a" on pages 79-80 | | | | |
| 13 | Collect a fee from each homeowner with a vehicle garage | Measure not specific in terms of intended effect—vehicle ownership decisions or travel behavior modification. | | | | No | Fee would need to have some connection to its use and beneficiaries which are not defined. |
| 18 | Prohibit on-site airport parking | Would encourage off site parking development, without necessarily resulting in use of transit or other HOV options. | | | Significant economic impacts on airports who must pay for their parking facilities | No | |
| 46 | Restrict trucks to hauling at night on Spare The Air days unless equipped with low emission technology | Appears to be a measure to encourage new technology; not a TCM. | Yes, see "40" page 123 | | | Truck idling would primarily affect NOx, which may not expedite attainment. | No. |
| 47 | Prohibit use of pre-1985 vehicles during episodes | See response to OWG "Suggestion 5" above | | | | Unlikely any such authority would be enacted. | |
| 56 | Increase gasoline sales tax | Results of past work show tax would have to be very high to reduce driving by any significant amount. Polling shows little support for gas tax increases. | Yes, See "17" on page 98 | Yes, unless tax very high | | Unlikely given difficulty in obtaining legislative and/or voter approval for a gas tax increase. | |

| Source | Description | General Comments | Previously addressed in 2001 Plan RACM Analysis? | Are reductions de minimis? | Economically or technologically infeasible? | Would measure expedite attainment date? | MTC authority to implement /enforce? |
|--------|--|--|---|----------------------------|---|---|---|
| 57 | Require passenger vehicles not meeting the standards of passenger cars to pay an annual fee and/or a fee upon purchase | Technology based; not a TCM | | | | | |
| 71 | Fee for Access to City Center for HD Vehicles or all vehicles | Similar to "23" above. | | | | | |
| 76 | Extend the Parking Cash-Out law to employer-owned parking spaces | See response above (Suggestion #10) | | | | No, given legislative difficulty in passing such a measure. | |
| 77 | Reduce the number of public parking spaces by 50% | Could lead to circuitous driving and extra emissions, particularly if there are not convenient alternatives to driving. | | | Significant economic impact on local retail activity. | No | |
| 78 | Emission based vehicle registration fees | Impact of one time fee on daily driving would be marginal; impact on vehicle ownership cannot be determined. | | Yes | | High fees would be controversial and legislation could be lengthy process | |
| 84 | Provide free public transit | Would require substantial new funding to replace fare revenues for Bay Area's extensive transit system. | Yes, see "1" on page 79 | | Economically infeasible. No funds available to compensate for significant lost fare revenues. | | |
| 85 | Eliminate airport parking and replace with alternative fuel shuttle buses | See "18" above | | | | | |
| 86 | Provide free public transit during episodes | Free fare demonstration project underway for Livermore area (LAVTA); difficulty in claiming SIP credits for episodic measures. | | on no. of new | Funding expanded free transit program during episodes would be problematic given current constraints on revenues caused by economic conditions. | | |
| 96 | Emission-based parking fees | Implementation likely impractical, given technological challenges and public/private control of parking space. | | | Technology for such a system is problematic. | Long lead time to develop/implement | No authority to impose such fees on private parking space |

| Source | Description | General Comments | Previously addressed in 2001 Plan RACM Analysis? | Are reductions de minimis? | Economically or technologically infeasible? | Would measure expedite attainment date? | MTC authority to implement /enforce? |
|--------|---|---|---|----------------------------|--|---|--------------------------------------|
| 97 | Increase fees for parking garages and meters during episodes | Occasional fee increases unlikely to affect travel on the few Spare the Air Days; difficulty in obtaining SIP credits for episodic measures. | | | Technological challenges to varying parking fees on a daily basis, particularly for unattended spaces. | | |
| 102 | Odd/Even License Plate No Drive Days | Many people would have no travel alternatives on No Drive days | | | Economic hardships for businesses due to difficulty for employees to get to work as well as retail businesses. | Controversial; legislative process would be lengthy. | |
| 104 | Reduce Work-Related Trips | Measure not specific. | | | | | |
| 107 | Dedicated Bus Lanes | | Yes, see "15" on page 114 | | | | |
| 111 | Improve safety and security on public transit | Programs would have indirect effect on ridership; emission reductions cannot be quantified. | | | | | |
| 113 | Displaying air quality data on billboards | No basis for estimating impact on travel behavior and emissions. | | Yes | | | |
| 118 | Increase Vehicle Registration Fee and Traffic and Parking Violation Fines | Impact of increasing parking fines cannot be predicted, and may not lead to change in driving behavior, simply more attention to meter time. | | | | | |
| 123 | Work-Related Trip Reduction Program | Public agencies cannot require employer based trip reduction programs under State law. | Yes, see "4" on page 87 | | | | |
| 145 | Public Education on NOx and ROG sources in Schools and Small Businesses | Effects of general educational programs on travel behavior cannot be predicted. | | | | | |
| 149 | Implement toll booths and pay-to- drive roads | Beyond paying tolls on bridges or new roads, this measure would have low public support. High Occupancy Toll lanes are under continuing review. | | | Widespread economic impacts if implemented on all roads. | Lengthy process to implement due to public/business concerns. | |

| Source | Description | General Comments | Previously addressed in 2001 Plan RACM Analysis? | Are reductions de minimis? | Economically or technologically infeasible? | Would measure expedite attainment date? | MTC authority to implement /enforce? |
|--------|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 154 | Implement public transit discounts and incentives for employees | Various transit fare discount programs already exist; various employers have transit incentive programs. | | | Economic conditions limit any further discounts to transit fares, which would represent a loss in revenues. | | |
| 157 | Require a surcharge to be paid by drivers during the summer season based on the number of driving miles | Mileage based fees would have to be significant to affect driving; mileage does not necessarily equate to emissions with newer cars | Yes, see "17" on page 98 | | | No, given difficulty is passing legislation to significantly raise auto fees | Unclear who would implement such a measure or how fees would be spent. |
| 169 | Install traffic circles at intersections | Emission benefits compared to well timed signals unlikely to be significant | | | Large costs to retrofit traffic circles into existing street system likely to be prohibitive, particularly in comparison to other transportation needs | | |
| 174 | Regional Rideshare Program | Program already exists and is periodically reviewed for improvement. | | | | | |
| 179 | Enhance real time traffic information to allow drivers to make better decisions about when and where to travel | to predict, as are emission | | | | | |
| 185 | Community-based shuttle system | Measure not specific | | | Widespread system would be problematic given current difficulties in sustaining existing public transit services, due to economic downturn | | |
| 187 | Bus Traffic-Signal Pre-emption | Effect of more reliable bus service difficult to predict, but measure warrants further consideration. | | Depends on routes/ ridership | | | |
| 195 | Public information about the total costs of gasoline use | Effects of general educational programs on travel behavior cannot be quantifiable | | , | | | |
| 201 | Increase Bike/Walk Trips | Measure not specific; also existing TCM addresses bike/ pedestrian travel (TCM B) | | | | | |

| Source | Description | General Comments | Previously addressed in 2001 Plan RACM Analysis? | Are reductions de minimis? | Economically or technologically infeasible? | Would measure expedite attainment date? | MTC authority to implement /enforce? |
|------------------------------------|--|---|---|----------------------------|--|---|--|
| 208 | Regional alternative work schedules | Shifting commute emissions to later time of day may be beneficial, but government cannot mandate work schedules | Yes, see "3" on page 86 | | | | Employers determine work rules and schedules |
| 294 | Implement traffic calming measures to reduce vehicle speed and encourage bicycle and pedestrian activity | | Yes, see "9" on page 91 | | | | |
| 304 | Increases the price of gasoline to pay for damages of pollution, cost of global warming (greenhouse gases), and cost of petroleum dependency | See response to 157 above | | | | | |
| 306 | Parking Cash Out | See response to Suggestion #8 above. | | | | | |
| 312 | Offers incentives to parking garage monthly passholders to not use their passes on busy parking days | Would apply to only a very small number of trips regionwide. | | Yes | | | |
| 314 | Subsidize Purchase of Bike Accessories | Measure not specific; impact on bike use unclear. | | Yes | | | |
| 368 | Light Rail Access to Airport | Fixed guideway transit already implemented at SFO and under development at OAK and SJC. | | | | | |
| Other | | | | | | | |
| MTC Minority Citizens Committee | Eliminate bridge tolls and increase gas tax to pay for bridge maintenance | Eliminating payment of tolls will not speed up traffic on bridges, if the bridges themselves are already congested. | Yes, see "29" on page 120 | | Bridge tolls cannot be eliminated as bonds have been sold for bridge improvements. | | |
| City of Emeryville | Improve bicycle storage process | Bicycle storage eligible for funding under existing TCM B. | | | | | |

| Source | Description | General Comments | Previously addressed in 2001 Plan RACM Analysis? | Are reductions de minimis? | Economically or technologically infeasible? | Would measure expedite attainment date? MTC authority to implement /enforce? |
|----------------------------------|--|--|---|----------------------------|---|---|
| Land Use Measures | | | | | | |
| SMAQMD 4 (for Bay Area) | Growth Policies | Smart Growth incentives are under development by the regional agencies, but will take time to formulate and adopt. Results are not expected until around 2010. | Yes, see "13" on page 94 | | | No, results from Smart Growth efforts will be beyond 2006. |
| SMAQMD 133 (for Bay Area) | | Related to above; effect depends on future amount and location of such development | | | | See above |
| SMAQMD 139 (for Bay Area) | Change Zoning Ordinances to encourage infill | Related to Smart Growth implementation. | | | | See above |
| SMAQMD 144 (for Bay Area) | | Implementation at regional level is problematic as no regional agency has authority to implement. | | | | See above |
| | to mitigate emissions from traffic generated by new development | Related to above; EIR process provides opportunity for agency comments on new development and required mitigation. | | | | See above |
| SMAQMD 371 (for the Bay Area) | Limit/control the further job housing imbalance to reduce commute travel | | | | | See above |
| | typical suburban neighborhood and another model "car free" | This would be a complement to the Smart Growth implementation discussion and could be accomplished outside the TCM process. | | | | |